

Amendment and Response

Applicant: Bill Eaton

Serial No.: 10/732,722

Filed: December 10, 2003

Docket No.: 200207091-1

Title: MULTIPLE INTEGRATED CIRCUIT CONTROL

REMARKS

The following Remarks are made in response to the Non-Final Office Action mailed February 25, 2008, in which claims 1-48 were rejected. Claims 1, 6, 7, 11, 18, 19, 24, 29, 30, 37, 39, 40, 43, 45, and 46 have been amended. Claims 1-48, therefore, remain pending in the application and are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

Claim Objections

Claims 6, 18, 29, 39, and 45 are objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim.

Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to remove “continuous timing” and claims 11, 24, 37, and 43 to remove “continuously timing”. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the objections to claims 6, 18, 29, 39, and 45.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 2, 6, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, for lacking antecedent basis for “the clock signal link”.

Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to remove “non-arbitrated”. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejections of claims 2, 6, and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph.

Claims 14, 18, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, for lacking antecedent basis for “the first date link”. Applicants have amended independent claim 11 to remove “non-arbitrated”. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejections of claims 14, 18, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph.

Claims 1, 2, 11, 14, 24, 25, 29, 30, 37, 39, 40, 45 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, for lacking antecedent basis for “the clock signal”. Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to remove “continuous timing” and independent claims 11, 24, 37, and 43 to remove “continuously timing”. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1, 2, 11, 14, 24, 25, 29, 30, 37, 39, 40, 45, and 46 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph.

Amendment and Response

Applicant: Bill Eaton

Serial No.: 10/732,722

Filed: December 10, 2003

Docket No.: 200207091-1

Title: MULTIPLE INTEGRATED CIRCUIT CONTROL

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-9, 11, 12, 15-21, 24, 26-34 and 37-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Schutte U.S. Patent No. 6,092,138.

Claim 1, as amended, recites, *inter alia*:

a clock signal link configured to communicate a clock signal generated by only the multiple integrated circuit controller to the integrated circuits during all of the data transactions between the multiple integrated circuit controller and all of the integrated circuits, the multiple integrated circuit controller including a second push-pull driver to drive the clock signal.

Schutte does not teach or suggest “a clock signal link configured to communicate a clock signal generated by only the multiple integrated circuit controller to the integrated circuits during all of the data transactions between the multiple integrated circuit controller and all of the integrated circuits” as recited in claim 1.

Schutte teaches that “[i]n some of the stations 10c, d the connection to the clocksignal conductor SCL, SCLH is coupled to the first powersupply connection Vss via the channel of a transistor 106c,d. Such a transistor 106a,b,e is optional in the other stations 100a,b,e.” Col. 4, lines 27-33. Thus, Schutte teaches that at least two of stations 10 (i.e., stations 10c and 10d) generate clock signals on clocksignal conductors SCL and SCLH. Schutte does not teach or suggest that only one of stations 10c or 10d communicates a clock signal to the other station during all data transactions between stations 10c and 10d. Accordingly, Schutte does not teach or suggest that only one of station 10c or station 10d “communicate[s] a clock signal ... to all of the integrated circuits during all of the data transactions between the multiple integrated circuit controller and all of the integrated circuits” as recited in claim 1. (Emphasis added.)

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the cited reference for at least these reasons. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 and claims 2-9 which depend from claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) be withdrawn.

In addition for claim 6, Schutte does not teach or suggest “wherein the clock signal link is further configured to communicate a continuous clock signal generated by only the multiple integrated circuit controller to the integrated circuits during all of the data

Amendment and Response

Applicant: Bill Eaton

Serial No.: 10/732,722

Filed: December 10, 2003

Docket No.: 200207091-1

Title: MULTIPLE INTEGRATED CIRCUIT CONTROL

transactions between the multiple integrated circuit controller and all of the integrated circuits and communicate the continuous clock signal generated by only the multiple integrated circuit controller between all of the data transactions” as recited in claim 6. (Emphasis added.) Applicants respectfully submit that claim 6 patentably distinguishes over the cited reference for at least this additional reason.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 11, 12, 15-21, 24, 26-34 and 37-48 patentably distinguish over the cited reference for at least the reasons given above for claim 1. In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 18, 29, 39, and 45 patentably distinguish over the cited reference for at least the reasons given above for claim 6. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 11, 12, 15-21, 24, 26-34 and 37-48 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 10 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schutte in view of Kawamoto US Patent No. 6,967,744.

Claims 13, 14, 25 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schutte in view of Lattice Semiconductor Corporation, Differential Signaling” – dated May 2001.

Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schutte in view of Baker et al. U.S. Patent No. 7,168,006.

Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schutte in view of Oppendahl U.S. Patent No. 5,500,861.

None of the cited references teach or suggest the features of independent claims 1, 11, 24, 37, and 43 that are not taught or suggested by Schutte as described above with reference to the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 11, 12, 15-21, 24, 26-34 and 37-48 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) be withdrawn.

Amendment and Response

Applicant: Bill Eaton

Serial No.: 10/732,722

Filed: December 10, 2003

Docket No.: 200207091-1

Title: MULTIPLE INTEGRATED CIRCUIT CONTROL

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that pending claims 1-48 are all in a condition for allowance and requests reconsideration of the application and allowance of all pending claims.

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to either Nathan R. Rieth at Telephone No. (208) 396-5287, Facsimile No. (208) 396-3958 or Christopher P. Kosh at Telephone No. (512) 241-2403, Facsimile No. (512) 241-2409. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

IP Administration
Legal Department, M/S 35
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,

Bill Eaton,

By,

DICKE, BILLIG & CZAJA, PLLC
Fifth Street Towers, Suite 2250
100 South Fifth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 573-2000
Facsimile: (612) 573-2005

Date: May 27, 2008

CPK:dmd

/ Christopher P. Kosh/

Christopher P. Kosh

Reg. No. 42,760